UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,220	02/14/2006	Young Jin Doh	9988.300.00	6259
	7590 06/26/200 ONG & ALDRIDGE L	EXAMINER		
1900 K STREE	T, NW	GRAVINI, STEPHEN MICHAEL		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20006		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3743	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/26/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/568,220	DOH, YOUNG JIN		
Examiner	Art Unit		
	7.0.0 01110		

	Stephen M. Gravini	3743					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 June 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar i, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	on.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL	Page 20 07 0FD 44 07	91- 1 - 20k2 (61b 1 (6				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of e appeal. Since a				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause				
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NOT	E below);					
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mplia n t Ame n dment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) rejected to Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4 and 6-15</u> .	Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-4 and 6-15						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)13. Other:							
	/Stephen M. Gravini/	nit 27/2					
	Primary Examiner, Art U	HIL 3/43					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The claims have been amended such that the scope of the claimed invention has significantly changed after a final rejection that would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The enablement rejection is withdrawn based on applicants' arguments. The obviousness rejection is maintained because the claims have been amended after final Office action and only the claims considered prior to the final action are considered. Te prior art still teaches the invention as claimed and the now claimed "formed at the securing member," "inserted" features and "convex toward" protrusion would require re-opening prosecution in order to determine patentability.